REMARKS

Oath/Declaration

Applicants wish to clarify that the claims to priority to two ancestor U.S. applications should have been made under 35 U.S.C. 120. A corrected Supplemental Declaration is attached from the parent.

Sequence Listing

The parent's Sequence Listing was transferred to this case. Related amendments to the parent are being made here also.

The Restriction Requirement

Applicants elect the claims of Group IV (claims 20-34), with traverse. The traverse is based, in part, on the fact that the subject matter of the claims of Group IV is related to that of the other claims in the application. Therefore, a search of all the claims in the application would not be an undue burden on the Examiner. If the search and examination can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. See, e.g., M.P.E.P. 803.

Applicants note an apparent error in Group III, *i.e.*, claims 25 and 27 are also included in Group IV. Applicants request that the <u>only</u> remaining claim in Group III, claim 19, also be examined with the elected claims, because the subject matter (at least as it relates to a method of therapy) overlaps with that of the claims of Group IV. See parent prosecution.

This application is related to U.S. Application Serial Nos. 10/321,558 filed December 18, 2002 and 11/637,810 filed December 13, 2006.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Anthony J. Zelano/ Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969 Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400 2200 Clarendon Boulevard Arlington, Virginia 22201 Telephone: (703) 243-6333 Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: ELLIS-0002-P02-C01

Date: February 23, 2007

AJZ:hlw K:\Ellis-2\P2\c1\Restriction response.doc